THE LAST LINKS IN THE CHAIN OF PARECT TESTI-MONY-MR. BEECHER AGAIN VALLED UPON TO DENY IN SPECIFIC TERMS T'IE COMMISSION OF ADULTERY-MR. MOULTON ANXIOUS TO KEEP BACK ALL MENTION OF THE GIFT OF \$5,000-MR. BEECHER ASKED TO EXPLAIN PASSAGES IN MRS. MORSE'S LETTEUS-HE AGAIN RECITES MORE MILLY THE SCENES WITH MRS. TILTON AND THE INTERVIEW WITH, MR. BOWEN IN DECEMBER,

Mr. Beecher's direct examination was concluded yesterday forenorm, 12:15 o'clock; and Mr. Fullerton began the cross examination. The direct testimony was fragments ry, including contradictions of ten or a dozen deels rations by the various witnesses for the plaintiff. M.r. Fullerton carried the witness in his narrative, which is being repeated very fully, to the door of Mr. Moulton's house on the night of Dec. 30, 1870. wid there stopped for the day.

CLOSE OF THE DIRECT EXAMINATION.

The dismal day had its effect on the number in atten ance and the humor of the audience and actors. Mr. Beecher was somewhat disposed to be gloomy. whis temper could be judged by his manner. Mr. Evarts was late, and the proceedings were delayed for a quarter of an hour. When they were opened it was soon apparent that Mr. Beecher's direct exammation had been virtually concluded the day before A number of questions were asked him about matters in relation to which Mr. Tilton and Mr. Moulton had testified. By one series of questions and answers it appeared, according to Mr. Beecher, that Mr. Moulton had expressed anxiety that no mention should be made of the \$5,000 given by Mr. Beecher for the benefit of The Golden Age, and had said that if mention were made of it he should deny having had it. Mr. Beecher denied that his card in the papers, calling on any person who had letters of his to publish them, was written at the suggestion of Mr. Moulton, and he affirmed that the original, which was intrusted to Mr. Moulton for publication, had been altered. Mr. Beecher, by another answer, intimated that Mr. Moulton had not produced in court all the letters which had been written to him by the defendant or intrusted to him. This was received by the plaintiff's counsel with indifference, as if little importance was attached to it. Mr. Beecher also explained, and Mr. Evarts insisted on his answer as material, that he had never read the Younger Dumas's novels, but had read in the Summer of 1874 the series of the Elder Dumas beginning with the "Three Guardsmen." As has been his habit since Mr. Beecher has been

on the stand, Mr. Evarts framed a climax; but as his final questions were repetitions of others asked at the beginning, and as the answers could be foreseen, the effect was rather tame. Mr. Evarts's art, however, was fully displayed even in this, for by his manner of putting the questions he secured their repetition in the hearing of the jury, which seemed to be his aim. The questions were those which were asked on the second day of his examination, as to Whether Mr. Beecher had ever improperly solicited or obtained any improper favors from Mrs. Tilton, or committed adultery with her. After emphatic de nials by Mr. Beecher, Mr. Evarts paused, as if to let the jury take it all in, and meantime glanced along -box. Possibly he observed that the ques tions had been lost on one or more of the jury, for again turning to the witness he asked if preliminarily to another question, that THE TRIBUNE stenographer would read the question. The reporter began with the last of them, but Mr. Evarts insisted upon his going back again, and the whole series was again read to the jury Then Mr. Evarts, in a more rapid manner than h had previously displayed, closed with a series of questions, the answers to which were denials of adultery at any time, denials of confessions of adultery or criminality, and denials of participation in conversations in which adultery was charged. 'That is all," said Mr. Evarts, nodding to Mr. Beach and his colleagues, and the direct examination of Mr. Beecher, which had lasted 712 days, was

MR. BEECHER UNDER CROSS-EXAMINATION. There was just the slightest stir of interest to indicate the close of the friendly inquiry and the opening of the hostile dissection of the defendant. All | cerned from dishenor in consequence of crime! A. No. there were signs of anxiety in some faces, and of interest in nearly all, to know what effect the change in his relations to the examiner would make in Mr. Beecher. It would be untrue to say that Mr Beecher appeared as unmoved when the cross-examination began as he had under Mr. Evarts's "coachine." for, however confident he may have felt, the signs of nervousness were manifest. It may have been nothing more than the nervousness natural to a change of positions—to the knowledge that in-stead of being led to the development of all that was favorable to his view of the case, he was now to be drawn into expressions detrimental, into admissions which might be construed to his disadvantage, into explanations of the more compromising passages in his correspondence, and, if possible, into a vexed state of mind, which would leave him incompetent to hear correctly, analyze promptly, and answer trathfully the intricate questions which were to be leveled at him. Whatever may have been its extent er cause, the nervousness was evident at the beginning of the cross-examination, though little remained of it at the close when Mr. Beecher had had an opportunity to warm up in describing the scenes December, 1870, with Mr. Bowen and Mr. Beecher. It is more difficult to describe these indications of nervousness positively than negatively. There was no trembling of hands or fingers; Mr. Beecher on asked for his memorandum-book, and opened and held it without the slightest agitation or tremulousness his bouquet was as tenderly handled as ever and as frequently carried to his nose. Frequent hesitation in answering, occasionally a guarded answer as if suspected a hidden meaning in the question, a gloomy and reserved manner, these were the chief and most marked indications that Mr. Beecher dreaded, in some degree at least, an ordeal which he admitted was new to him. It did not continue long-at least not to the close of the examina tion-and when he had left the witness-chair at o'clock he said jocosely that he did not feel that his "hide had been taken off," "though," he added "there's no telling what will come to-morrow."

The cross-examination by Mr. Fullerton took wide range, and fer the first two hours was rather rambling and confusing to the audience if not to the witness. His first determined effort was an elaborate attempt to draw Mr. Beecher into an unqualified condemnation of Mr. Tilton's teachings as editor of The Independent, and an admission that, knowing that Mr. Tilton denied the divinity of Christ and was otherwise losse in his wiews on orthodex doctrines and had indeed foreshadowed his views on marriage and divorce, the witness held bim unfit to be the head of the paper. This was done with the intention, subsequently developed, of sking Mr. Beecher how he had come to place and sestain such a person at the head of a paper of which he was himself the nominal and responsible editor. L'ut Mr. Beecher evaded the point by saving that he looked upon Mr. Tilton's as a crude mind passing through the state natural to all young reflective natures when traditional religious beliefs give way to personal beliefs. Hedid not think that Mr. Tilto was an unfit person to conduct suck a paper as The Independent, which he described, in a dry, humorous way, as a secular, and "in some sense a religious paper." Mr. Fullerton passed to another topic, First of all, he tried to commit Mr. Beecher to

pasitive statement as to when in 1871 Mrs. Beecher had left Brooklyn for the South. He could fix it no more definitely than "early in the year." The purpose of this was not seen until later in the day, en Mr. Fullerton read a letter from Mr. Beecher of Jan. 28, 1871, to Mrs. Morse, in which he speke of Mrs. Beecher and himself still thinking a quiet course was wises. The idea of Mr. Fullerton was

THE TILTON-BEECHER TRIAT, | doubtles to show that it was a false pretense that Mrs. Beecher was a party to the communication. But it was not shown that Mrs. Beecher had left Brooklyn for the South at this time.

A number of Mrs. Morse's letters were called up, and Mr. Beecher was asked to explain the meaning of certain passages in them, but he was unable to do so, saying if he had ever known their significance he had forgotten it. Rides and walks with Mrs. Tilton, visits at the house, the mode of salutation between minister and parishioner, and many minor matters of like import were made the subjest of tediously minute inquiries. Mr. Fullerton then pierced the center of the case. He asked Mr. Beecher once more to narrate the incidents of Bessi Turner's visit to him, his conference with Mrs. Tilton, and his advice to her to separate from her husband, the visit of Mr. Bowen on Dec. 26, 1870, the threatening letter of Mr. Tilton, and the interview with Mr. Moulton which led up to the scene of Dec. 30, 1870, and the final accusation by Mr. Tilton. When he struck the first of these incidents, Mr. Beecher's self-possession was fully restored, and he gave the scenes more in detail than he had done before, and with fewer interruptions. The descriptions differed in no material sense from those of the direct testimony, but there was not the same form of construction or a similarity in language which notably marked the repetitions of some of the other witnesses.

Mr. Beecher's cross-examination will probably begin this morning with the recital of the interview of Dec. 30, 1870, when Mr. Tilton accused him of adultery (according to the plaintiff) or improper solicitations (as the defendant insists).

MRS. TILTON'S TESTIMONY.

It is probable that no objection will be made to the reception of Mrs. Filton's testimony, which the defense will probably offer next week. Mr. Morris of counsel for Mr. Tilton stated yesterday that the plaintiff's counsel would not object to the reception of her testimony, and Judge Neilson had already said to a TRIBENE reporter that, both sides consenting, he should permit her to be sworn.

Mr. Beecher's testimony will unquestionably clos this week, if not indeed on Thursday; Mr. Cleveland may then be called; or Mrs. Tilton may be put on the stand if Mr. Cleveland's illness continues. The future may affect the views of the defense in this regard, but it is more than probable that the plans above indicated will be followed.

THE PROCEEDINGS-VERBATIM.

GEN BUTLER'S MESSENGER.

The Court met at 11 a. m., pursuant to ad-Mr. Beecher was recalled, and his direct examination

Mr. Evarts-Mr. Beecher, this Mr. Henry A. Bowen that you have snoken of as baying made some commu nication to you concerning Gen Butler, which you had spoken of to Mr. Moulton—who is he; who is Mr. Henry A. Bowen † A. He is the oldest son of Mr. Edward

Bowen, a member of my congregation. Q. Was he a gentleman at any time connected with you in any way-Mr. Henry A. Bowen f A. No. Sir; I had known him since he was a boy, but he was in no way

Q. And this communication that he volunteered to you all that you know about what Mr. Butler had said A. That is all; he was a messenger, and delivered his

MR. TILTON PLEASED WITH HIS WIFE'S STORY TO THE COMMITTEE.

Q. Mr. Beecher, I call your attention now a statement by Mr. Moulton concerning an interview between yourself and him after Mrs. Tilton had given a statement before the Committee of Investigation. Mr.

Moulton says:

I said to Mr. Beecher that after Mrs. Tilton had made her statement to the Committee Mr. Tilton was very much incensed, and that Mr. Tracy, in a subsequent interview with him—in an interview subsequent to Mrs. Tilton's report to the Committee, or statement to the Committee—had so presented to him the influence which her statement had had upon the Committee that it melted the anger all out of Theodore Tilton, and he was perfectly willing to make a statement to the Committee which should not contain the fact of adultery between Mr. Beecher and Mrs. Tilton.

Was anything said to you by Mrs. Maniton at that interview.

Was anything said to you by Mr. Moulton at that interview, or at any interview, on this subject, that Mr. Tilton was willing to make a statement to the Committee which should not contain the fact of adultery between Mr. Beecher and Mrs. Tilton ! A. No. Sir; he did state to me

the fore part of that conversation.

Q. Yes. I will get the conversation in a moment. Did in any such conversation say to you that Mr. Tracy had said that it would not be hard to get from the Committee a report (unfavorable, it is true, to Mr. Beecher). on the ground of the offense, but which would really settle the whole business, and save all the parties con-

between yourself and Mr. Moulton, as you recall 11 A. I do not remember the special circumstances under which it took place, Sir, nor where. I recollect Mr. Moulton saying to me that Mr. Tilton was wonderfully incensed that his wife should go down and make a statement before the Committee, but that after he saw Mr. Tracy, and found out what was the substance of her statement, he on the whole, seemed to be well pleased.

MR. MOULTON WANTS THE GIFT OF \$5,000 KEPT SECRET.

Q. I call your attention now to a statement of Mr. Moulton of an interview with you, the circumstance f which will be sufficiently disposed of by my reading the statement itself. Mr. Moulton is asked:

"What did you communicate to Mr. Beecher?" and unswers: "I fold Mr. Beecher that Mr. Tracy wanted me to communicate the fact that I had received \$5,000 from Mr. Beecher to give Mr. Tilton, in order to stop him from he publication of his statement. I said when Mr. Tracy wanted me to tell Mr. Tilton that, that that would be a wanted me to tell Mr. Tilton that, that that would be a scrous embarrassmen to me personally, in consequence of my having received that money, and I said to Mr. Seeher that I toki Mr. Tracy that I was perfectly willing to be guided by him with sound advice—with any moral, odd reason—with any good reason, and I would coperate with him to induce Theodore Tilton not to pulse him statement, but I would not, on any such ground a that, undertake to stop its publication. Mr. Tracy sid me that would cause me trouble if it was pubsibled "——

Though I believe this is not a statement of what he said to you.

Mr. Beach-Yes, it is.

Mr. Evarts-Do you think so ! [Reading.] Ar. Tracy told me that that would cause me trouble if was published, and I told him if it caused me trouble, must cost me trouble; that I had done no wrong, and idn't fear any trouble that would come from that.

I don't know whether that chause is what he said to ou, but I have read you the whole of it. Now, Mr. secher, do you remember a conversation had with Mr. Moulton in which this matter of the \$5,000 was spoken

Q. And how; please state how that occurred ! A. I think it occurred. Sir, on that same Sabbath afternoon in which I returned from his house, but I will not be definitely certain about that time-in that neighborhood. le a ked me suddenly, after we had been talking about one and another topic, whether I had mentioned that \$5,000 to anybody, and I said to him I had, and he wanted to know who, and I mentioned. Well, he said that would not do any hurt there, but I must not mention that; that he should deny it; if snybody charged him with it, or stated it, that he should deay it.

Q. Did you tell him what you had said about it, and to

Q. What was it? A. What I had said about it! Q. Yes; did you tell Mr. Moutton what you had said bout it, and to whom you had stated? A. I did.

Q. What was lif A. I told him that I mentioned it Oliver Johnson, and that I had mentioned it to Oliver Johnson because Mr. Johnson said that he had been vis ging, as I understood it, at Mr. Curtis's in New-York, and heard censures upon my unwillingness to assist Mr. Tilton from time to time in his embarrassments and troubes, and I told him that it was not sothat I had always said, from the beginning, that I would to whatever would have any prospect—that is, within reasonable bounds-have any prospect of helping him in as difficulties, or out of them, and that I had secently advanced \$5,000 on the representation that it would set The Golden Age quite affoat.

Q. Did Mr. Moulton in this conversation with you exess himself as to what he felt about your having told that to anybody ! A. He asked me with solicitous em phase if I had; and when I told him who I had he said. well, that would do no harm; that he was content with that; I am not giving his words; I am conveying the

Q. Now, Sir, in regard to this conversation about Mr Moulton about this \$5,000 and his communicating itand his (Mr. Tracy's) wishing that Mr. Moulton sh communicate the facts about that \$5,000 to Mr. Titton do you remember whether that formed a part of th conversation! A. Oh, no, Sir; it did not. Judge Neilson-Mr. Evarts, the reporters request that

MR. BEECHER'S CARD INVITING HIS ENE-MIES TO THE FIELD. Mr. Evarts-I have been reading from page

trouble to give the page; they think it will facilitate.

when you read a clause from the book you will take the

134 the last time, and from page 131 the former time—
of the pamphlet. [To the Winess.] Mr. Beecher, I call
your attention to a card, "Brooklyn, June, 1873."
There does not seem to be any other date to it—Exhibit No. 29. Inst look at it and get the matter in your mi and then I will ask you some questions about it. [Handing witness the exhibit.] This is on page 101. June 30 this publication seems to be. [To the winess.] Well, Sir, I call your attention to that card as it was prepared, and as it was published. Please state how that matter occurred. This is the card, if your Honor please, and the

jury, in which Mr. Beecher says:

Application has been made to Mrs. Victoria Woodhull for certain letters of mine, supposed to contain certain information respecting certain infamous stories against me.

* These and all letters of mine in the hands of any other persons, they have my cordial consent to publish.

Q. Now, please state, Mr. Beecher, how that matter came up. A. Well, it came up on a report, I think, in The Sun; I did not myself read it, but heard that there had

been published in The Sun an account of a visit-Q. The New York Sun! A. The New York Sun; yes Sir; an account of a visit of Mr. Bowen, accompanied by Mr. Claffin, to Mrs. Woodhull, in search of certain docu ments supposed to be damnatory; and, upon seeing that, Mr. Cleveland dropped in a morning after—a morning or two-I have forgotten exactly how long-and suggested

Mr. Beach-That is not proper.

Mr. Evarts—No. if it is objected to.

The Witness [continuing]—the subject matter of a card; I thought his suggestion, or general direction, to be wise; and I went right into the study at Mr. Beach's house and drew up, substantially, that card-

Mr. Beach-Whose house ! The Witness-Mr. Beach's. I was there. By Mr. Evarts-Mr. Moses Beach ! A. Mr. Moses S.

ch 96 Columbia Heights. Q. You drew this card! A. I drew this card, the substance of it, and after I drew it I read it to a friend, Mr. Ford, within a few-within half an hour after writing it, I think. I then took it down to Mr. Moulton. Mr. Moul ton was delighted with it; he told me that he read it to several persons, and they spoke of it with pleasure, as being apt and sufficient, and so on. I left it in his hands then to be published, with discretionary power. wrote to me after I left on Monday morning-I think it was published on Monday afternoon-he wrote to me

the publication of that—

Mr. Evarts—That letter is in evidence, is n't it?

Mr. Beach-No, the letter is not.

Mr. Evarts-Well, if it is a letter that is not in evidence you cannot refer to it. There is semething about it-The Witness-He repeated to me afterward the substance of what the letter contained; it was simply this, that if it was thought best that there should be a little prefatory matter put upon the card explaining the reason why there was something in it that I had not written.

Mr. Evarts—Weil—

Mr. Beach—Oh, there is no objection to it.

Mr. Evarts-I understand you, then, that this card riginated with yourself, and was carried by you to Mr. Moulton, and did not originate with him! inated with me, and was carried to him, and then I left it with him to make in it unimportant changes-anything that would not invalidate the substance of the card.

Q. Mr. Moulton has said that he called attention to this publication about Mr. Bowen and Mr. Claffin going to Mrs. Woodhull, and that he saw you about it, and he says that he said to you, "I think, Mr. Beecher, we can make very short work of such business; I think and you think that Bowen has not any evidence in his possession against you, and we had better publish a card in The Eagle calling upon anybody with any papers or evidence against you to produce them; and Mr. Beecher prepared A No. Sir: he is mistaken about that Sir. suggestion of it came from Mr. Cieveland, and I carried t to Mr. Moulton.
Q. The first introduction of the matter between you

and him was your showing him the card you had prepared ! A. Yes, Sir.

Q. Now, Sir, some alterations were made, which are apparent in the publication as actually produced and the card as originally prepared. Mr. Moulton says in respect

of that:

I saw Mr. Beecher subsequently, and he said he approved of the alterations, and thanked me for my kind offices in the matter, and Mr. Beecher said to me furthermore, "Of course Mr. Tilton will not produce any documents." "Well," I said, "of course he won't; he has not got any that I know of, original documents, to produce, and of course I won't." Did you ask any such question or receive any such an-

Q. Did anything of the kind occur ! A. No, Sir.

STOPPING UP THE CHINKS IN THE DIRECT. Q. Mr. Beecher you have spoken heretofore of your having received, I think, three letters from Mrs. Woodhull; do you remember now having received an-

Q. When was that! A. I don't know; it preceded another meeting at Steinway Hall. I received a letter fram Woodbull inclosing one, I think, from my sis Mrs. Isabella Hooker, and it was that they were-

Mr. Beach—One moment. Produce the letter. Mr. Evarts—We have got the letter here.

Mr. Beach-You had better produce it, then.

Mr. Evarts-He has spoken about letters before in general way, and you did not require that they should be

Mr. Beach-We had learned of the others. Mr. Evarts-Please find that Mr. Shearman. [After earch.] That letter is not in court, but I will show it to you afterwards; if you want it produced we will produce it. [To the witness.] Are you able to state the time of that letter! A. No. Sir. I could easily ascertain , but I have not had my attention called to it so as to

inform myself about it. Q. Was it in reference to a public meeting at Steinway Hall! A. It was.

Q. Of what ! A. It was with reference to a meeting in inway Hall-

Mr. Fullerton-The letter will speak for itself.

The Witness [Continuing.]—For Woman's Suffrage.
Q. Of what society? A. It was what we should call ow the New-York wing of the suffrage movement, and women suffrage movement.

Mr. Beach [To Mr. Fullerton. |-Haven't we got a copy of that letter ! Mr. Fullerton-No, it is the reply.

Mr. Evarts-Mr. Beecher, Mr. Tilton says in the cours of some testimony about the letter to a complaining friend and another brief letter to a friend at the Westin that relation, or as part of his statement concerning that, he uses the expression to which I now ask your attention. He says: "I will also say that during that month of December I prepared another statement, a long document, which has become technically styled, I don't know why, the 'True Story,' for it was not a true story, it was a false one," and then be says: "Mr. Beecher said he could not bear the publication of that, that it would kill him." Now, Sir, did you ever use an expression to Mr. Tilton that the publication of the "True Story would kill you? A. I think not, Sir. I did tell him that I would not bear it.
Q. That you have stated. A. It was not that I could

not bear it, but that I would not bear it Q. You used no such expression, then! A. No. Sir; not

in any such sense as it is there. Q. I ask your attention now to a statement of Mr. Moulton in reference to the period after the publication of the "Tripartite Agreement," and a proposed, or threatened letter of Mr. Tilton in reference to that publi cation. You remember that situation and that time! A.

Q. Now, Mr. Moulton says that at that interview you used this expression, that " if Theodore Tilton publ that letter it would simply be his [Mr. Beecher's] death." He was asked, " whose death I" and he answered, Beecher's death." Now, did you say that to Mr. Moulton! A. No. Sir; I said to Mr. Moulton is regard to that whole matter, that the publication of that eard, as I understood its contents, would be-that it would be a publication that no man, if it were made and believed, e stand up under-no clergyman ; and that if he made that publication, it should be the end ; that I would not stand it ; that I would fight it. Q. Then Mr. Moulton speaks about your showing him

the draft of the resignation that you had prepared, and says he said to you "that that would not do at all; that that was a virtual confession of the crime, and that it was an act of cowardice on his (your) part to do it." Did he use any such language as that to you! A. No, Sir. He dissunded me from publishing that card—
Mr. Fullerton—One moment. The question is answered.

ssuading you from the publication of that card! A. [Continuing.] As unnecessary; that the matter could be arranged, that by or through his influence with Mr. Filton, and his restraining him, the matter need not come to such a crisis. Q. Of your resignation ! A. Of the presentation of that

contion or an equivalent. Q. Mr. Moulton states an interview of this kind; he that in this same connection of the resignation he had an interview with Mr. Tilton, and that he reported question: "What did you say to him !" "I said Mr. Tilton strongly objected to the publication of the resignation, on the ground that it was a clear statement, in

his opinion, of the shame of his wife;" and he says that you replied—no, he says he does not remember your reply, but that he said further, "Clearly that is the case, Sir; clearly, if the resignal uld be published, it would be a virtual confess the fact of your relations with Mrs. Tilton, and it ought not to be done." Did any such thing occur? A. No. Sir; that is, neither he nor I uttered any such words as that

Q. Then he says further: "I told Mr. Beecher that Mr. Tilton was quite violent; Mr. Tilton said that he would shoot Mr. Beecher if he did it; I think that I pentioned that to Mr. Beecher; that is what Mr. Tilton told me, at all events." Did Mr. Moulton communicat that to you? A. I think he did not, and I know he did

Q. You never had any such threat as that communieated to you! A. Oh no, Sir; I had never any such

Q. Please look at this letter, and see if it is the letter of Mrs. Woodhull that you referred to in your testim this morning. A. Yes, Sir, I should think this is the letter; this is the contents of it; I am not familiar enough with her handwriting to say this is her handwriting. Mr. Evarts-I will read this letter. [Reading.]

No. 44 Broad-St., New-York, Feb. 7, 1872.

REV. H. W. BEECHER: From the inclosed letter you will perceive that Mrs. Hooker requests me to security Hall for our May convention. I saw Mr. Steinway, who objects to letting our association have the hall way, who objects to letting our association have the main-but will do so upon your recommendation, which, of course, you cannot object to giving, since it is for a cause in which many of your friends are engaged. Will you be kind enough to send me what you feel is right in the mat-ter by the return mail, and very much oblige yours, sin-cerely.

Have you any knowledge or recollection of any other etters than have now been referred to by you! A. I have not, Sir.

dence various letters that you wrote to him during the course of these years of your association with him; did you write other letters than those that have been produced! A. Yes, Sir: I did.

Q. I now call your attention to a statement of Mr. Moulton's. Mr. Moulton mentions an occasion on which, you and he being talking, Mr. Jeremiah P. Robinson came along, and in reference to that interview he is asked to state whether Mr. Beecher knew from him at that time that Mr. Robinson had been put in possession of these secrets, and Mr. Moulton says I told him that I had told both Mr. Woodruff and Mr. Robinson. Had you A. He never told me any such thing about either of them. I had no knowledge in regard to either of them. Q. Then he is asked: "What did you tell Mr. Beech

you had told Mr. Robinson," and he answered, "I told him that I had told him the fact concerning the relation between Elizabeth Tilton and himself." What did you tell tall him you had told Mr. Woodruff! A. The same. Q. Had Mr. Moulton informed you before that time or at

any time that he had told either of his partners? A. Neither before that time, nor at that time, nor at any time after. Q. Now, Mr. Beecher, I call your attention to a state

Q. Now, Mr. Eescher, I call your attention to a statement of Mr. Moulton's of this kind:

I remember, Sir, having said to Mr. Beecher that I had been questioned by Mr. Baxter on the subject, and by others, whose names I don't now recollect, and that I had undertaken to mislead them by stating to them in the first place that if the story was true, it was infamous, and it it was false, it was diabolical; that if his inte was not an answer to it, I didn't choose to make any, and that idin't think it was necessary; but that being pressed close, I had denied the truth of the criminal intercourse with Mrs. Tilton, and said he was a pure man.

Then Mr. Moulton says, that in answer to that you thanked him-you said you thanked him for doing that, and you said there was only one way, since lying wa ary, and that was to lie sublimely. Did anything of that kind occur! A. I must dispute the parentage of Q. Did you say anything of that kind! A. I did no

say anything of that kind. I never used that phrase at all, nor did I ever thank him for the special service which he alleged he rendered to me through Mr. Baxter. He did state to me that he had seen Mr. Baxter, and that he had told him that if my life of 25 or 30 years was not an answer to the Woodhull scandal, then character was good for nothing.

Q. Did you, in that conversation, or in any convers: tion, receive from him a statement that he had fled for you; and did you, in reference to any such statement, or in any manner, thank him for lying for you? A. No. Sir; I never did; nor did he ever say it, to give me an oppor tunity to do so.

Q. Did he ever say or intimate to you that in the state

ments of exoneration of you, which he had made to others, he had spoken falsely! A. No, Sir. Q. Mr. Beecher, something was said by Mr. Redpath about his finding you reading a novel of Dumas's. A. It is a fact.

Q. Which of the Dumas, the elder or the younger! Mr. Fullerton—Is that material!
The Witness—Dumas, the father; the old one.

Mr. Evarts-There is a very great difference between

Mr. Fullerton-Yes: in age. Mr. Evarts-Yes; and in the character of their novels. The Witness-I have never read anything of the

Dumas this was that you were reading ! A. I only know that that summer I read the "Three Musketeers-" is it! or the "Three Guardsmen;" the "Count of Braganza "-isn't there something--- t

Q. Well, you may state. A. There are three stories onnected in a series.

Q. Well, one of them is what ! Mr. Beach—One of them is "Twenty Years After." The Witness—One is "Twenty Years After."

Mr. Evarts-One is the "Three Musketeers," and one The Three Guardsmen," is it not !

Mr. Fullerton-[Virtuously.] I don't know; I have ever read them. [Laughter.] Judge Neilson-I think he has given them correctly. I

ave read them more than once. The Witness-I have read them; I have also read

Mr. Evarts-Well, it was one of those novels that you were reading ! A. Yes. Sir; it was one of those novels. Mr. Fullerton-I am not prepared to cross-examine in

regard to this. [Laughter.]

Mr. Evarts-Oh, you can read up; you can read up Q. Mr. Beecher, in the early stage of this examination when I had brought the matter down to December, 1870 in your relations with the various parties who figu this matter. I inquired of you whether there had been any improper relations between Mrs. Tilton and yourself in various forms of question; I now have to ask you whether since the 1st of December, 1870, and until the commencement of this suit, there have been any imroper relations between Mrs. Tilton and yourself ! A.

Q. Have you asked from her any improper favors! A

Or received any from her ! A. None whatever. tercourse, with her since the period I name until now A. No. Sir.

Mr. Evarts [To The Tribane stenographer]-Will you b good as to read my last question,-I don't want to leave any gap ! The Tribune stenographer read the question as fol

Have you had any sexual intercourse or carnal inter-ourse with her since the period I name until now ! Mr. Evarts—Read what I stated before that. The Tribune stenographer read the four questions and

answers, as follows: Q. Mr. Beecher, in the carly stage of this examination, when I had brought the matter dawn to be examinated.

tion, when I had brought the matter down to December, 1870, in your relations with the various parties who figure in this matter, I inquired of you whether there had been any improper relations between Mrs. fliton and yourself, in various forms of question; I now have to ask you whether since the 1st of December, 1870, and until the commencement of this sait, there have been any improper relations between Mrs. Tilton and yourself! A. None at all, Sir.

Q. Have you asked from her any improper favors! A. None whatever.

Q. Or received are from the said to the property are from the said of the said to the said of the said of

ione whatever.
Q. Or received any from her! A. None whatever.
Q. Have you had any sexual intercourse, or carns
ntercourse with her since the period!! name until now O. I will now ask you, Mr. Beecher, whether, from your

first acquaintance with Mrs. Tilton until the present time, you have ever had any improper relations with her received any favors from her unsuitable for a woman to grant, asked any such favors from her, or ever had any sexual connection with her ! A. No, Sir, I never have. There has been nothing between her and me answering Q. Mr. Beecher, Mr. Tilton was asked this general ques-

tion at the close of his direct examination: Now, I want to ask you this general question, whethe from first to last Mr. Beecher ever dealed the crumin-intercourse with Mrs. Tilton t He answered, "No. Sec."

I ask you, in connection with that question and that nswer, whether Mr. Tilton ever used to you, or in your presence, any language of accusation, or imputation, or course between yourself and Mrs. Tilton ! A. Never Q. Now, the answer proceeds with this statement-the

answer of Mr. Tilton [after a pause], as it is stated the substance of it to you, and he says, in unswer to the

saying that whenever he spoke of it he always said that the criminality attached to him alone, and not to Mrs. Tilton; always insisted that she was not to blame; he was the person on whom the condemnation should fall. Did you ever make any statement of that kind or effect

in connection with any accusation, imputation, or intimation of criminal intercourse between yourself and Mrs. Tilton, or in any answer you made to any such acques tion, imputation, or intimation ! No, I never did. Sir.
Q. And Mr. Moulton was asked at the close of his redi-

rect examination:
There is but one other question, Mr. Moulton, and it is
this: In any of the conversations to which your attention has been called on your cross-examination by the
other side, with Mr. Beeeher, or to which your attention
was directed upon direct examination, did Mr. Beeeher
ever deny to you his sexual intercourse with Mrs. Tilton?
A. Never.

Now, Sir, did Mr. Moulton in all his intercourse with you, in any of his conversations with you upon the sub-ject of your relations with Mrs. Tilton, or any of the sub-jects connected therewith that formed the topics of conversation between you at any time, make any accusation. or imputation, or intimation of sexual intercourse be tween yourself and Mrs. Tilton 1 A. He never did, Sir.

CROSS-EXAMINATION OF MR. BEECHER.

When the answer to the last question was given, Mr. Evarts bowed, and, without saying a word, sat down. Seeing the movement, Mr. Fullerton understood that the direct examination was finished, and, open ing a large portfello, containing sheets of foolscap, with clippings from THE TRIBUNE'S report pasted on them, and comments in pencil in the margins, he rose and began the cross-examination, as follows:

WHY MR. BEECHER PREFERED THE NEW-

ENGLAND FORM OF OATH. By Mr. Fullerton-Mr. Beecher, when the Bible was presented to you with a view to administer the oath, I believe you refused to swear upon it—preferred to swear with the uplifted hand. Has that been your custom elsewhere in taking an oath ! A. I had never taken-I had no custom of taking oaths; I had never to my memory taken an oath until this suit began, except to swear to a document or something of that kind, and always then I had been called to swear by the uplifted hand.

Q. Did you appear before the Grand Jury when the indictment was found against Theodore Tilton ! A. I did. Q. Did you then and there swear upon the gospel f A.

I presume I did, Sir. Q. Don't you recollect that you did ! A. I do not rec Q. You did not state then and there that you had contentious scruples against swearing upon the Bible ! A

Q Have you no recollection upon the subject as to whether you did then and there swear on the Gospels! Mr. Beach (to Mr. Fullerton)-What were his conscien-

tions scruples ! Mr. Fullerton-Yes: what were your consciention scrupies when you were asked to take an eath in this use! A. It did not appear to me, Mr. Fullerton, until after I came into court here and heard the various witnesses swearing to examine into the oath minutely, and when I came to swear I feit that I was unwilling to swear except by affirmation; I should-my private preference would have been the oath, but if I swore in the ordinary sense of the term " swearing," by nothing else than by God, and not by any lower form or symbol of the Divin

Q. Do you recoiled how you swore to the document that you speak of-whether by the uplifted hand or upon the Gospeis ! A. To what document, Sir !
Q. Tac one that you allusted to. I refer to the answer in this case ! A. I don't take your meaning, Sir; excuse

Q. The answer that you put in to the complaint of the plaintiff in this case is a sworn answer! A. Yes, Sir Q. It was not sworn upon the Gospels when you affixed our name and swore to the contents of it, was it ! A. I

think I did not, Sir. Q. Have you any recollection upon the subject ! A. I ecollect of the time of swearing to it, and where I swore o it, but I don't recollect swearing upon the Gospels. Q. Do you recollect that you did not a year upon the

Q. Then you have no recollection on the subject, I take it! A. I have a recollection of everything except he particular form in which I took the oath. It was adninistered to me in New-Hampshire, and whatever the ustomary form there is, that I took.

MRS. BEECHER'S ABSENCE IN 1871. Q. Following the course of the direct examotion I will now ask you whether Mrs. Beecher was not

absent in the early part of 1871 from this city and from this country—from this city! A. The early part of 1871: She may have been gone in the month of January, 1871, but I cannot speak assuredly from memory now. She was not gone until about that time. Q. Don't you recollect that Mr. and Mrs. Moulton met

Mrs. Beecher in Florida during their absence in the early part of 1871 f A. I recollect that Mr. Moulton spoke to e and my wife afterward of a meeting there, but M Beecher went down early in the year of 1871, and Mr. Moulton in March of 1871, and it was somewhere after the 1st of March, probably in April, that they met in

Q. You are not able to state, as I understand you, the particular time when Mrs. Beecher did leave for the South n that year ! A. I think I could, probably, if you will llow me to look at my chronology. Mr Fullerton-Certainly.

The Witness-It may have been put down there. There are a few of those- [Referring to a paper.] I don't see any record of it given, Sir.

Q. Do you recollect the duration of her absence at that time! A. I think she returned in May, Sir, but I cannot be very certain of it. Q. Can you state who was your housekeeper during that

ence of Mrs. Beecher! A. It was May, in 1871. [After thinking.] I cannot recall who it was.
Q. Was it not one of your sisters! A. My sister, Mrs Perkins, kept house for me during two seasons, two

absences, but I cannot just at this moment fix the date of

Q. Was she the only sister who kept house for you durng any absence of Mrs. Beecher! A. She was.

Q. Can you now state that Mrs. Perkins did not keep house for you in the latter part of 1871, when Mrs. Beccher was absent in the South! A. I don't at present cel willing to make a definite statement on that matter, because it may have been in 1872, the Winters of 1872-3

and 1873-4, but I do not remember distinctly now. Q. Was Mrs. Becaher ever absent at the South without your having a housekeeper? A. She was not; I think ot. My daughter kept house for me one season, Mrs. Perkins two seasons. Q. And can you name any other person! A. I don't

ecollect any now.

MR. TILTON'S RELIGIOUS DEFECTION. Q. When did you first hear anything to the effect that Theodore Tilton had fallen from the ortho faith ! A. Well, in that very broad form, I don't know that I exactly had heard of it until quite late, but sugges tions of looseness and of dangerous tendencies I heard as early as 1865.

Q. Looseness in what respect † A. Looseness in regard to his theological views.

Q. Well, then, you don't regard them as orthodox, if he was loose- A. I did, substantially, in the early part. I thought only that he was going through that ferme tion of mind which every ingenious and active-minde man goes through, or ought to go through, by which the traditionary beliefs are changed to his present beliefs. Q. When did you hear that he had got through! A. I

his faith! A. I have heard, certainly, that he was not through that fermentation.

have never heard it, Sir. [Laughter.]

Q. Have you not heard, and frequently heard, that he had settled down upon what might be termed infidel notions in regard to religion! A No, Sir; I don't know Q. In your direct examination you spoke of some arti-

les of his published in The Independent which excited come comment in the North-West. Among others you ailuded to your brother, Dr. Edward Beecher. Do you recollect what those articles were, the subject of them A. If I recoilect aright, those articles-I never have read them since the day that they were published, that I now recall—they were giving the idea of the Catholic mission of The Independent, of the largeness of its Catholicity, and the comprehensiveness of the minds that it meant include; and I recollect very distinctly saying that I egarded Mr. Tilton as stating what probably was a truand safe thing in an inexperienced manner that would excite the fears and alarm the prejudices of a great many good men.

Q. The deetrine there taught in those articles you apechnical sense of the term.

Q. The policy ! A. No, Sir; I did not think the policy

Q. Did you think it was sound? A. If it was not wise Q. Then you thought it was unsound, did you! A. I

thought it was unsound in the sense of policy.
Q. Did you think the sentiments were true

therein expressed? A. It was not a question of sentiment, Sir; it was a question of policy, the conduct of the

Q Did you think the criticisms of your brother Dr. Edward Beecher were well founded! A. No, Sir; I did not, because the criticisms were upon me.

Q. Supposing you to be responsible for the paper A.

Yes, Sir; he thought I still was responsible for the paper

to a degree.

Q. Well, did you approve of the criticisms, so far as the articles themselves were concerned, irrespective of any question that was imputed to you! A. Did I—

Q. Approve of the articles ! A. Of the artic

Q. Yes, Sir 1 A. No, Sir; I don't recall that I ever did. Q. Did you ever see in The Independent any article im puted to Theodore Tilton which you thought to be un-sound in religious doctrine! A. I do not recall now that I ever had brought to my attention any article that dis

ussed doctrinal questions by him.

Q. Did you ever read any of his teachings that you thought were pernicious in their effect! A. I don't now recall anything except that which I criticised on the ground of an injudiciousness in the conduct of the paper, or a partial or an unfair statement of truths which I thought he could have stated conscientiously better.

Q. To what extent were complaints made of his relig ous doctrines and teachings! A. That I am not able to sav. Sir. except--

Q. So far as they came to your knowledge! A. I have an impression that with what are called the rigorously orthodox of New-England, and with what were called the orthodox of the North-West, there was a growing di

favor to his teachings; it was my general impression. Q. Didn't they excite distrust in Mr. Tilton as a religious teacher! A. Did they not in the mind of these

Q. Generally, so far as you were informed of the effect of his articles! A. My impression was that the more rig-orous orthodox were steadily being set against him, but that their place was being taken by what would be called the progressive wing of the Church.

Q. Well, judging from what you heard as to the effects of his teachings upon the public or Christian mind, did you think that he was a safe Christian teacher ! A. I would not have said that I thought him to be a safe pub lie teacher of doctrinal matters, but from the time that he assumed the chief management of the Independent, namely, from 1874 to 1875-

not think of him in the light of a doctrinal teacher; I thought of him in the light of one who applied ethical matter to practical things. Q. He was the editor of the Independent, was he not?

Q. And it was a religious paper! A. Not in the sense of a radically religious paper.
Q. In any sense was it a religious paper? A. Yes, Sir,

Sir; it passed in that class unquestionably.

Q. Didn't it promulgate the special doctrines of a class of Christians ! A. It did when it was under the direction

fallen from the grace of doctrinal teaching. Q. And assumed what character? A. It assumed far more a question of vital religious form and of vital public ethics, and discussed living questions from the tandpoint of Christian truth. Q. Then, you never saw anything in The Indepen

caused you to distrust the soundness of his religious views? A. No. Sir; you don't understand me right if you understand me so.

Q. Then, please set me right by what you have to say upon that subject! A. I said that I regarded him as being in a transitional state, and as holding imperfect views which would gradually be ripened and become

Q. Did you think that he expressed his real sentiments in the articles that appeared in The Independent ! A.

Q. When did you first hear of his wife complaining of him in respect to his religious doctrines ! A. I cannot give you any further special date, Sir; I think as early as it may have been as early as 1865 or 1866, along there

safe for her to bring up her children under such influences as he exerted in respect to religious doctrine! A. L could not recollect it any more than to say it was between a term of years.

Q. Locate it as near as you can! A. I should say be-

ween 1865 and 1869. id you then learn specifically what his views were . I had learned from him during that time more or les the unsettlement of his faith in the Divinity of Christ.

Scriptures, but what is called a loose doctrine of inspira-

Q. Well, as loose as Theodore Tilion's was! A. That is too remote, Sir, and the question itself is so precise-Q. As loose as you learned it to be from him or from his wife! A. I regarded his doctrine of the Divinity of Christ as worse than loose; I thought that to b

Q. And you learned that as early as what year! A. I cannot say, Sir. Q. Prior to 1869, I understand you? A. Prior to 1869,

Q. Well, that being his belief upon that subject, do ; ou think that he was a fit man to be at the head of a re ligious newspaper! A. I think that if he was at the ad of a theological magazine he would be the last man that was fit for it, but as the head of a paper that didn't

of Christian ethics, I didn't see anything in that, Q. You thought it was well enough! A. No, Sir, not

Q. You read The Independent, did you not ! A. Not much after I left it. Q. Didn't its views accord with your own! A. Yes. Sir, I suppose they did; I might have picked out of it a vast amount that did, but I didn't read it.

DISSATISFACTION WITH MR. TILTON IN THE

said heretofore. Please look at that passage marked in red, and state whether it refreshes your recollection as Mr. Fullerton [Showing book to Mr. Evarts.]—The pages are unlike. [To the Witness.] See if you re-

effect: (Reading.)

Some years before any open trouble between Mr. Tilton and myself, his doctrines, as set forth in the leaders of The Independent, aroused a sterm of indignation among the representative Congregationalists in the West; and as the paper was still very largely supposed to be my organ, I was written to en the subject. In reply I indignantly disclaimed all responsibility for the views expressed by Mr. Tilton. My brother Edward, then living in Illinois, was prominent in the remonstrance addressed to Mr. Bowen concerning the course of his paper under Mr. Tilton's management. It was understood that Mr. Bowen agreed, in censequence of proceedings arising out of this remonstrance, to temove Mr. Tilton of Epi-ress his peculiar views, but instead of that, Theodore seemed firmer in the saddle than before, and his loose notions of marriage and divorce began to be shadowed editorially. This led to the starting of The Advance in Chicago, to supersede The Independent in the North-West, and Mr. Bowen was made to feel that Mr. Tilton's management was seriously injuring the business, and Mr. Tilton may have felt that his position was being undermined by opponents of his views with whom he subsequently pretended to beleve I was in league.

Do you recollect that I. A. Yes, Sir, substantially that. effect: [Reading.]

Do you recollect that ! A. Yes, Sir, substantially that Q. Was that substantially true! A. It was, Sir. sub-

Congregationalists with regard to his views! A. Of the Q. Of the North-West-and you indignantly disclaimed all responsibility for the views expressed by Mr. Tilton, did you! A. I did, to my brother Edward; I was never

O. What gave rise to your indignation! A. Because my prother wrote me a very severe letter.

Q. Indignant at him-is that the sentiment express here which I have read! A. I don't know how, Sir

Q. [Reading.] "In reply I indignantly disclaimed all

The Witness-I beg your pardon-1864 and 1865: I did

I think it was in some sense.

Q. Was it not regarded as a religious paper! A. Yes,

of Dr. Bacon, Dr. Storrs, and Dr. Thompson. Q. Under the direction of Mr. Tilton ! A. I don't think Q. Before that it did, you say! A. Before it passed out of the hands of those gentlemen it did.

Q. Had it failen from grace in that respect? A. It had

s coming from Theodore Tilton, and never heard of anything, as I understand you, from any quarter, in the way of criticisms upon his teachings and sentiments, that

more perfect, but I had hope of him in his career, how-ever much I might think that certain parts of it were im-

Q. When was it she consulted you as to whether it was

I learned also from him that he was inclined to what might be called not an unbelief in the inspiration of the ment! A. It depends upon how loose it is.

I think, but I will not be very positive.

undertake to expound theology, but only the application

Q. It might be better? A. But it was tolerable Q. Well, it was telerable; that is all; it could be en-ured I A. It was a thing to be endured. Q Did you not think it would be better to have some sounder man at the head of that paper! A. I do not

know that it occurred to me.

NORTH-WEST. Q. Now, Mr. Beecher, in that connection I lesire to call your attention to something that has been

nember at any time of having said anything to this

Q. There was, then, a storm of indignation among the

brought into any relations with Congregationalists of the North-West, as such.

Q. Well, you were not indignant at your brother? A. 1

responsibility for the views expressed by Mr. Tilton?" A. In reply I indignantly expressed—disclaimed all responsibility—for the views expressed by Mr. Tilton; my